

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04080 01 OF 02 251436Z

46

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 EUR-25 H-03 INR-11 IO-14

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 PA-04 PM-07 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07

DRC-01 /153 W

----- 118956

R 251335Z JUL 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6895

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 4080

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: UK COMMENTS ON PAPER ON IMPLICATIONS OF REVISED DATA IN  
RELATION TO GROUND FORCE DEFINITION ISSUE

REF: USNATO 4035

THE FOLLOWING ARE COMMENTS WHICH THE UK HAS SUBMITTED ON SUBJECT  
PAPER WHICH WAS TRANSMITTED REFTEL. WG WILL DISCUSS SUBJECT  
PAPER JULY 30.

BEGIN TEXT:

DPS(D)37/1(4(74)-

DATED 23 JUL 74

MBFR-A REVIEW OF SOME ANOMALIES IN THE FORCES TO BE ADDRESSED IN  
THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04080 01 OF 02 251436Z

UK PRELIMINARY COMMENT ON SITCEN 1902

GENERAL

1. IN GENERAL THE FORMAT FOR THE DRAFT WORKING GROUP REPORT

AND ALSO, SUBJECT TO THE IMPLICATIONS TO BE DRAWN FROM THE TWO OMISSIONS FROM THE DRAFT REPORT REFERRED TO IN 2 BELOW, THE THRUST OF THE PAPER IS AGREED.

2. THE OMISSIONS REFERRED TO ARE:

A. THE DRAFT REPORT USES DATA FOR THE AIR DEFENCE PERSONNEL OF BOTH SIDES DERIVED FROM US NATIONAL ESTIMATES WHICH APPEAR TO US TO BE OUT OF DATE (TABLE 3 TO WCA/15/156/74, NOTE 1 REFERS). THE REVISED ESTIMATES FOR THIS FIELD, TO WHICH ATTENTION WAS DRAWN IN AC/276-D(74)6, ANNEX III, PART III, REVEAL THAT THE FIGURES USED IN THE CALCULATION OF THE "SECOND POSSIBILITY" MAY NEED FAIRLY DRASTIC ADJUSTMENT. THIS COULD AFFECT THE IMPLICATIONS.

B. NO REFERENCE IS MADE IN THE REPORT TO THE FACT THAT THE WP IN NEGOTIATIONS MAY REFUSE TO ACCEPT NATO ESTIMATES FOR WP MANPOWER STRENGTHS WHICH, ACCORDING TO THE IMS INTELLIGENCE DIVISION, COULD BE UP TO 10 PER CENT IN ERROR. THEREFORE THE STARTING POINT FOR WP REDUCTIONS COULD BE (ACCORDING TO THE WP- AND NATO COULD BE HARD-PRESSED TO CHALLENGE IT) NOT 952,000 BUT 860,000. SHOULD THIS PROVE SO, WP REDUCTIONS DOWN TO A COMMON CEILING AT, SAY, 712,000 WOULD, UNDER THE "FIRST POSSIBILITY", FOR EXAMPLE, BE (860,000-28,000) 832,000 TO 712,000, RATHER THAN 860,000 TO 712,000. THUS THE "FIRST POSSIBILITY" COULD INVOLVE NATO IN MAKING FAR GREATER CONCESSIONS TO THE WP THAN THE DRAFT REPORT INDICATES. IN OTHER WORDS, WE SUGGEST THAT THE DRAFT REPORT SHOULD EMPHASISE THE MILITARY DANGERS OF NATO MAKING DECISIONS REGARDING CONCESSIONS TO THE CURRENT REDUCTION PROPOSALS UNTIL A DATA BASE FOR REDUCTIONS IS AGREED WITH THE WP.

DETAILED COMMENTS ON SITCEN 1902

3. PARAGRAPH 1B. THE WORDING USED IS WRONG. CASE 2 OF THE AHG PAPER SUGGESTS THAT ALL AREA AIR DEFENCE PERSONNEL ON BOTH SIDES WHO MAN GROUND SYSTEMS IN THE AREA AIR DEFENCE (DEFINED AS INTEGRATED AIR DEFENCE COMMANDS SEPARATE FROM ANY GROUND FORCE COMMAND) SHOULD BE EXCLUDED. WE ALSO DISPUTE THE ACCURACY  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04080 01 OF 02 251436Z

OF THE 13,000 FIGURE FOR BOTH SIDES QUOTED. IN NATOS CASE, THE FIGURE SHOULD NOT INCLUDE THE 1,100 MEN OF THE UK THUNDERBIRD REGIMENT (WHO ARE UNDER COMMAND OF 1(BR) CORPS AND WHOSE TASK IS PROTECTION OF THAT CORPS), WHILE THE WP FIGURE TO BE EXCLUDED MUST INCLUDE ALL WP SOLDIERS EMPLOYED IN THE COMMAND AND CONTROL ELEMENTS AND RADAR UNITS FORMING PART OF THE AREA AIR DEFENCE ( BELGIAN RADAR AND EW PERSONNEL ARE INCLUDED IN THE NATO TOTALS) AS WELL AS THOSE WHO MAN SURFACE TO AIR WEAPONS SYSTEMS.

4. PARAGRAPHS 1C AND 2A. IF SSM ANOMALIES ARE TO BE THE THISRD POSSIBILITY, THEN PARAGRAPH 11 IS ON THE WRONG SUBJECT.

5. PARAGRAPH 2A. 29,000 IS NOW NOT THE CORRECT FIGURE FOR

NATO AIRMEN, UNLESS THE INTEGRATED AIR DEFENCE ORGANISATION FOR NATO CONTAINS NO COMMAND AND CONTROL OR RADAR PERSONNEL APART FROM THE BELGIANS REFERRED TO IN PARAGRAPH 3 ABOVE. THE 11,000 FIGURE FOR GDR AIRMEN IS ALSO SUSPECT WHILE THE NON FIGHTER UNIT MEMBERS OF THE POLISH, CZ AND SOVIET AREA AIR DEFENCE ORGANISATION SHOULD ALSO BE ADDED TO MAKE A WP TOTAL OF SOME 40,000.

6. PARAGRAPH 5, PUNULTIMATE LINE. THE EXCLUDED PERSONNEL ARE NOT NECESSARILY REGARDED "AS ORGANIC TO FIELD FORCES". WE SUGGEST THAT THE PHRASE REFERRED TO IN PARAGRAPH 3 ABOVE SHOULD BE USED.

7. PARAGRAPH 6D. ADD "BEARING IN MIND THAT THE WP MAY REFUSE TO AGREE THE ESTIMATES OF WP STRENGTH ATTRIBUTED TO THEM BY NATO AND INSIST ON THE USE IN NEGOTIATIONS OF LOWER FIGURES.

8. PARAGRAPH 7, FIRST TABLE, SECOND ALTERNATIVE. THE NATO FIGURES SHOULD READ 778,000 (NOT 770,000)- IE 791,000 MINUS 13,000. THE WP FIGURE COULD BE VERY DIFFERENT (SEE PARAGRAPH 2A ABOVE.

9. PARAGRAPH 8. THE FIRST SENTENCE MAY NEED AMENDMENT IN THE LIGHT OF PARAGRAPH 8 ABOVE.

10. PARAGRAPH 8B. THE RATIONALE FOR THE STATEMENT IN THE LAST SENTENCE IS NOT UNDERSTOOD.

11. PARAGRAPH 8D, LAST SENTENCE. THIS ASSERTION IS DISPUTABLE  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 04080 01 OF 02 251436Z

THE SOVIETS MAY CONSIDER THAT IT WOULD BE UNWISE FOR THEM TO REDUCE SIGNIFICANTLY THE SIZE OF THE WP AREA AIR DEFENCE ORGANISATION SINCE IT PROVIDES SECURITY NOT ONLY FOR THE NSWP COUNTRIES CONCERNED BUT ALSO FOR THE SFE MOBILISATION AND MOVEMENT FORWARD INTO AND WITHIN THE AREA BY SOVIET REINFORCEMENTS IN A PERIOD OF TENSION. WOULD THE WP HIGH COMMAND NOT USE SIMILAR ARGUMENTS TO THOSE USED IN PARAGRAPH 12 OF THE REPORT TO SHOW THE DIFFICULTIES AND DANGERS OF REDUCING WP AIR DEFENCE? UNDER CASE1, FOR EXAMPLE, BY EXCLUDING 41,000 POLISH AND CZ SOLDIERS, OVERALL WP REDUCTION IN PHASE II OF THE TABLED PROPOSALS WOULD BE CUT FROM 157,000 TO 116,000. AS THERE WOULD BE NO REASON WHY THE WP COULD NOT STILL TAKE THE SAME SCALE OF REDUCTIONS FROM NON COMBAT OR NON COMBAT SUPPORT TROOPS IN CASE 1 AS UNDER THE EXISTING NATO PROPOSALS (CALL IT 50,000 MEN), WP COMBAT AND NON-COMBAT FORCE CUTS WOULD TOTAL ONLY 66,000 IN CASE 1 AS COMPARED TO 107,000 UNDER THE EXISTING TOTALS (A DIFFERENCE IN TERMS OF DIVISIONAL MANPOWER OF ABOUT FOUR DIVISIONS). CAN NATO AFFORD TO TAKE THE CHANCE THAT IN IMPLEMENTING THIS CONCESSION, THE WP WILL NOT ADOPT A COURSE LESS FAVOURABLE TO NATO THAN INDICATED NOW IN PARAGRAPH 8D OF THE REPORT? IN ANY CASE, WE SUGGEST THAT THE IMPLICATIONS TO THE WP OF CASE 1 AND 2 SHOULD BE DEALT WITH UNDER THEIR SEPARATE PHASES.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 04080 02 OF 02 251443Z

46

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 EUR-25 H-03 INR-11 IO-14

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 PA-04 PM-07 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07

DRC-01 /153 W

----- 119020

R 251335Z JUL 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6896

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 4080

12. PARAGRAPH 10. UNDER BOTH CASES, THE WP COULD CIRCUMVENT THE AGREEMENT BY DECLARING THAT WP FORMATIONS WOULD NO LONGER CONTAIN INTEGRAL AIR DEFENCE UNITS BUT WOULD RELY UPON THEIR AREA SYSTEMS FOR PROTECTION (WHICH THEY COULD THEN INCREASE IN SIZE). THE WP COULD THEN USE THE ARMY MANPOWER COVER WITHIN THE AGREEMENT SAVED THEREBY, TO INCREASE COMBAT ELEMENTS OF FORMATIONS. IT IS QUITE TRUE THAT A POSSIBILITY TO CIRCUMVENT AN AGREEMENT IN THE AIR DEFENCE FIELD EXISTS NOW UNDER THE TABLED NATO PROPOSALS BY A TRANSFER OF AIR DEFENCE RESPONSIBILITY FROM GROUND TO AIR FORCES, BUT THAT IS PERHAPS AN ARGUMENT IN FAVOUR OF THE WP PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE BOTH AIR AND GROUND FORCES IN REDUCTIONS.

13. PARAGRAPHS 12 TO 14. THE AHG PAPER USES THE 700,000 COMMON CEILING FIGURE ONLY FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES AND THIS FIGURE IS NOT AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE AHG CASE TO ALTER THE DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES. IT IS SUGGESTED THEREFORE, THAT THE WG DRAFT REPORT SHOULD COMMENT ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF CASE 3 ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NATO 10 PERCENT REDUCTION CONCEPT WHICH IS AFTER  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04080 02 OF 02 251443Z

ALL THE AGREED NATO MAXIMUM REDUCTION FIGURE. THUS PARAGRAPHS 12 TO 14 CAN BE OMITTED FROM THIS PAPER AND PARAGRAPH 15 CAN BE USED AS THE BASIS FOR THE COMMENTARY ON CASE 3. THE POINT COULD PERHAPS BE MADE IN FAVOUR OF CASE 3 THAT IT IS BASED ON SOME LOGIC, WHEREAS

CASES 1 AND 2 HAVE LITTLE LOGIC BUT POSSIBLE NEGOTIATING APPEAL.

14. WP DATA ESTIMATES. IT IS SUGGESTED THAT ANEW PARAGRAPH SHOULD BE INSERTED PRIOR TO THE CONCLUSION SECTION TO DRAW ATTENTION TO THE ISSUE REFERRED TO IN PARAGRAPH 2B ABOVE OF THESE COMMENTS. THIS PARAGRAPH WOULD REQUIRE A WORD OF CAUTION TO BE ADDED TO PARAGRAPH 22A.

15. CONCLUSION. THIS WILL NEED REVISION IN THE LIGHT OF OUR COMMENTS.

16. EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO AHG PAPER. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF EDITORIAL AND FACTUAL ERRORS IN THE AHG PAPER- FOR EXAMPLE, IN PARAGRAPH 6, THE SENTENCE IN BRACKETS IN ABOUT LINE 5 SHOULD READ "US AND BE AND SOVIET AIR DEFENCE PERSONNEL" ETC. WE SUGGEST THAT THE WG REPORT SHOULD DRAW ATTENTION TO THESE ERRORS, POSSIBLY IN AN ANNEX. END TEXT RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 25 JUL 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO04080  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740788/abbrywid.tel  
**Line Count:** 235  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** USNATO 4035  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 24 JUL 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <24-Jul-2001 by kellerpr>; APPROVED <14 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** UK COMMENTS ON PAPER ON IMPLICATIONS OF REVISED DATA IN RELATION TO GROUND FORCE DEFINITION ISSUE  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO BONN  
LONDON  
MBFR VIENNA  
USCINCEUR  
USNMR SHAPE  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005